REMARKS

Claims 1-78 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 19, 29, 37, 47, 55, 63, and 71 are independent claims. All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The rejections are traversed.

Regarding Rejections

Claims 1-78 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,338,067 to Baker et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,628 to Dobson et al. As previously argued, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness.

As disclosed and claimed by the Applicants, a series of raw data values (e.g. daily closing stock prices) are stored in a database. For the series of raw data values, a plurality of intervals of adjustment data (e.g. split adjustments) are also stored in the database. By retrieving an adjusted data value from the database, such as to compute a moving average, the intervals of adjustment data are applied to the raw data values. Those calculations are performed in response to the retrieval process by, for example, defining a database view to associate the raw data values with the adjustment data.

As described in the Applicants' specification, interval adjustment data is used to adjust the raw data over an interval of the series (e.g. stock price over a period of time) to yield adjusted data values for a selected point in the series. These adjustments are needed to accurately use data over different periods in the series, such as earlier data with later data, because of, for example, the value of money or the impact of a stock split over time.

By maintaining current adjustment values in the database, the Applicants can transparently retrieve adjusted data values. The cited references do not teach or suggest such a system.

The primary reference, Baker, discusses a product hierarchy database. As previously discussed, FIG. 7 of Baker is the only example of using pricing data. As shown in FIG. 7, the stored time series data values are merely tabulated for display. Baker does not teach or suggest applying adjustment values (split values) to raw data values (security prices) during retrieval from the database. Nor does Baker teach or suggest the claimed "adjustment data."

The Office's response to Baker's deficiencies is off the mark. The fact that Baker may suggest various modules and data fields does not mean that Baker suggest the claimed "adjustment data" and the application of the "adjustment data" to raw data values. Again, although Baker stores split data, it is never applied by Baker to adjust the stock prices. Indeed, the Office Action agrees that Baker fails to teach the claimed "plurality of intervals of adjustment data" and "each interval of adjustment data including an adjustment value to be applied to raw data values over a range specified in the series."

For those limitations, the Office Action cites Dobson. The reliance on Dobson is faulty for the same reason the previous reliance on Ma was faulty—Dobson is merely related to rendering data values on a display.

In Dobson, the stored values of the data being displayed are never adjusted. As can be easily seen by examining FIGs. 1 and 2 of Dobson, the data values remain the same. Dobson, indeed, does not adjust the raw data values; only the data value representations. In other words, a data point having a value of 80% in FIG. 1 also has a value of 80% in FIG. 2.

To establish a prima facie obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the office has the burden of showing that all claim limitations can be found in the prior art, as properly combined. That burden has not been met in this case.

First, the office action fails to address all claim limitations. As recited in all claims, the plurality of intervals of adjustment data are stored in a second database structure. While Dobson is proported to teach a plurality of intervals of adjustment data, the scaling adjustments to the rendered chart are done interactively (Dobson, col. 3, ll. 14-27). There is no suggestion or need for scale intervals and the like to be stored in a database.

Second, the Applicants' claims recite that adjustment values be applied "in response to retrieval of an adjusted data value from the database." Baker provides split data but does not apply it to raw data values to yield an adjusted data value. Furthermore, Baker provides no method of retrieving an adjusted data value. Nor does Dobson. This is a typical prior art approach, where Baker's data would be reported to and processed by another application.

If combined, Baker and Dobson would yield a prior art charting system. The stored data from Baker would be charted by Dobson. A user could then scale the rendered charts various

ways to better view the data. Additional steps would then be required to apply the split data to raw stock price data. Such prior art techniques differ from the claimed invention.

Again, as claimed, the Applicants apply adjustments to the raw data values during retrieval from the database. That adjusted data could then be charted, for example, by Dobson's method.

The cited references fail to suggest the claimed method of applying interval-based adjustments to data in a database, including "for a series of raw data values, storing a plurality of intervals of adjustment data in a second database structure" and "associating the first and second database structures so that the adjustment value is applied in response to retrieval of an adjusted data value from the database" as claimed. In particular, the cited references fail to suggest "a view of the database" to associate the structures and "using the view to apply the adjustment value to the raw data values during retrieval" as claimed. The dependent claims include further distinguishing limitations.

The Office Action fails to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration of the rejections of Claims 1-78 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _____

Rodney D. Johnson
Registration No. 36,558
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Dated: April 15, 2005

OID-1999-128-01